DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 187 UD 022 667

AUTHOR Orfield, Gary; And Others
TITLE School Desegregation Patterns in the States, Large Cities and Metropolitan Areas, 1968-1980. Working Pa
INSTITUTION Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 66p.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Students; *Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Litigation; Differences; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; *Hispanic Americans; Inner City; Metropolitan Areas; Migration; *Racial Composition; Racial Segregation; *Regional Characteristics; School Districts; White Students

ABSTRACT

Data collected nationwide from 1968 to the 1980-81 school year form the basis of this report on changes in school racial composition in States, Metropolitan areas, and large cities. Trends in the percentages of Black, Hispanic, and White students are discussed by region. It is indicated that the greatest gains in desegregation of blacks have taken place in the South, probably due to the relatively strong enforcement of civil rights policies in this region. Another major trend discussed is that of increasing segregation of Hispanic children in all parts of the country. Based on the analysis of data from metropolitan areas and cities, it is suggested that the key to reducing segregation has been the implementation of desegregation plans on a metropolitan or city wide basis in the districts that still retain white majorities. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227187

Joint Center
For
Political Studies

ED 022 667

WORKING PAPER: SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PATTERNS
IN THE STATES, LARGE CITIES
AND METROPOLITAN AREAS
1968-1980

A report to the Subcommittee on Civil
and Constitutional Rights of the
Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S.
House of Representatives

Prepared by
Gary Orfield
Professor of Political Science
University of Chicago

for the
Joint Center for Political Studies
Washington, D. C. 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary Orfield
Joint Center for Political Studies
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Since the fall of 1981, the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights has been conducting extensive hearings and studies of school desegregation in the United States. Chairman Don Edwards requested that the Department of Education supply the subcommittee with primary data on the levels of segregation of black and Hispanic public school students. These data, covering the period from 1968--when systematic federal data were first collected--to the 1980-81 school year, were provided in the form of printouts prepared by the DBS Corporation for the Education Department. Chairman Edwards then requested that the Joint Center for Political Studies analyze the data and report to the committee on their implications.

This report is the second part of the center's response to that request. The first part was a report submitted to the committee in September 1982. It analyzed the broad national and regional trends in the desegregation of black and Hispanic students. It showed that the southern and border states led the nation in desegregation of black students, that segregation of black students was increasing in the Northeast, and that there has been a serious increase in the segregation of Hispanic students in all regions of the United States.

This second report focuses in on states, metropolitan areas, and large cities. It shows substantial variation among these areas, indicating that the general changes are not simply products of particular legal or historical patterns affecting regions. This variation makes it possible to consider the likely effects of various types of desegregation plans on the extent and durability of desegregation.

This report was prepared by Gary Orfield, professor at the University of Chicago, under contract to the Joint Center for Political Studies, with the invaluable assistance of Michael O'Grady, U.S. Department of Education; Nancy O'Connor, research assistant at the Brookings Institution; and Helene Kim, research assistant at the University of Chicago.

© 1983, Joint Center for Political Studies

The 1980 city data and much of the state data in this report are here released for the first time. And this is the first time that any federal racial data for schools on a metropolitan level have ever been released.

TRENDS IN THE STATES

American states differ greatly in their racial compositions, population trends, and levels of school segregation (see Appendix A). In some states, virtually all black and Hispanic students attend well-integrated schools, with no discernible trends toward segregation. In others, segregation of black and Hispanic students is intense and rising.

In about a third of the states, there is no possibility of significant additional busing for desegregation in the near future, because there is no significant school segregation. Some states that had very substantial segregation problems have made remarkable progress in desegregation within a very few years. Much of the remaining segregation is located in a few large industrial states.

There were 20 states in 1980 with more than three-fourths of the black students in majority-white schools (Table 1). Most of these states had very few students in segregated schools. In the case of Hispanic students, who are highly concentrated in a few parts of the country, the great majority of the states had little serious segregation in 1980. In 29 states, less than a fourth of the Hispanic students were in predominantly minority schools.

These statistics show that in major regions of the United States, there are no serious segregation problems at this point, either because there are few minority children at all or because states already have desegregation policies that have eliminated most segregation. Although the issue is commonly discussed as a national policy problem, contemporary segregation is actually most severe in a relatively small number of states. Within those states, the large-scale segregation often exists in one or a handful of metropolitan areas.

The problem is that many of the states with serious segregation remaining are those with the largest percentages of minority children. Most black students attend schools in just nine states: New York, Texas, Illinois, California, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, Louisiana, and Michigan. Unfortunately, Illinois, New York, Michigan, and New Jersey head the list in segregation of blacks, and a number of the other states rank close behind. Among those states with the largest black enrollments, only Florida and North Carolina rank high in the achievement of desegregation, for reasons that will be discussed later.

Hispanic students are even more highly concentrated in certain areas. A substantial majority of all Hispanic pupils in the United States attend schools in California and Texas. Most others live in New York, New Mexico, Illinois, Florida, and Arizona (Table 2). The growth in Hispanic enrollment is most rapid in the same areas.

New York is by far the most segregated state for Hispanic students. In California, Illinois, and Florida, Hispanic segregation is increasing rapidly, and in Texas, an already severe segregation problem is slowly becoming more intense (see Table 2). The existing trends in the states most important for Hispanics show that segregated education is likely to continue expanding.

Blacks and the Southern and Border States. The 17 southern and border states have shown the most dramatic changes since the Supreme Court ruled out "freedom of choice" desegregation in 1968 and approved the use of busing in 1971. The dramatic changes over the entire region, however, do not tell the whole story. Among these states, which are subject to the same general legal requirements, desegregation has occurred in very diverse ways and has had strikingly different results. Increases in the percentages of black students attending majority-white schools ranged from 0 to 41 percent during the period

studied. Three of the states today have more than nine-tenths of their black students in integrated schools, 1 state has more than three-fourths of its black children in predominantly minority schools, and 5 others have about two-thirds of their black pupils in such schools.

Table 3 shows that the largest increases in integration have taken place in Delaware, Kentucky, and Florida, each of which had begun to desegregate at the beginning of the period and made decisive increases in integration during the seventies. The increases are clearly related to the county-wide city-suburban busing plans implemented in many Florida districts in 1971 and the similar plans imposed in metropolitan Wilmington and Louisville by federal court orders later in the decade. At the other end of the spectrum, with the lowest gains and continuing high levels of segregation, are several states and the District of Columbia, in which very large numbers of black students attend separate central-city district schools that enroll relatively few white students and have limited desegregation plans or none at all.

Recent Resegregation in Some States. Among the southern and border states, 3 have shown some significant increases in the percentages of black students in intensely segregated schools since 1974. From 1974 to 1980, the percentages of black students in schools that were 90-100 percent minority rose 9.4 percentage points in Tennessee, 5.0 percentage points in Florida, and 4.3 percentage points in Mississippi. These changes indicate the need to update desegregation plans periodically to deal with the growth of segregated residential patterns if the accomplishments of the last generation are to be consolidated.

Changes in Segregation of Black Students in the North and West. Most of the massive changes in racial segregation since the sixties have been in the southern and border states. Many northern and western states have very small

black populations. Among those in which at least 5 percent of the students are black, only 9 have had substantial changes in black segregation patterns--Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin (Table 4). Schools in New York and New Jersey have become substantially more segregated. These states, along with other industrial states where school desegregation has not changed substantially, have the most segregated schools in the United States.

The 4 states with the most segregated schools for blacks in the United States, according to the three measures used in this study (percentage of black students in predominantly minority schools, percentage of black students in 90-100 percent minority schools, and percentage of whites in the class of a typical black student), are Illinois, Michigan, New York, and New Jersey (Table 5). Also included among the top 10 in each of the three measures are Pennsylvania, California, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Missouri and Texas are among the most segregated on two of the measures. Thus, the 4 states with the most segregated schools, and 2 others among the top 10 (California and Pennsylvania) are outside the southern and border state area. None of these highly segregated northern and western states is among the 10 states with the highest black percentages in total state enrollment. The southern states, with considerably higher proportions of blacks to desegregate, have less segregated school systems.

Outside the South, the states with the largest gains in desegregation are those in which black students are concentrated in one or a few urban centers and where there have been major court orders requiring urban desegregation. In Nebraska, the Omaha court order ended most segregated education in the state; in Wisconsin, most blacks live in Milwaukee, and a court-ordered desegregation process emphasizing magnet schools significantly reduced segregation;

Ohio has been the scene of very active litigation and major court orders in Cleveland, Columbus, and Dayton, as well as a voluntary plan in Cincinnati. Blacks in Nevada are concentrated in the Las Vegas area, where a metropolitan plan was implemented; Denver was the location of the first Supreme Court busing plan affecting a non-southern school district; and Indiana has had major court-ordered desegregation in Indianapolis.

In New Jersey and New York, the only states where black segregation has increased significantly, there have been some successful efforts to desegregate small cities and the suburbs of large cities, but there have been no significant desegregation plans in the largest cities. Segregation has increased primarily because of the rapid declines in whites in the central-city school districts and the steady spread of ghettos and barrios to cover more and more of the central cities.

Changes in the Segregation of Hispanic Students. The trends in desegregation of black students are full of complexities and cross currents, and there have been vast increases in desegregation in some areas. In contrast, the pattern for Hispanic students is overwhelmingly toward greater segregation. Between 1968 and 1980, a great deal of effort went into desegregating black children, but very little attention was paid to the increasing segregation of the rapidly growing Hispanic communities. Hispanic settlement is highly regional, and Hispanic school enrollment has become very large in certain states (Table 6). With the exception of Colorado, these states all show increasing segregation.

The changes are particularly important in the three states that educate 69 percent of Hispanic public school students--California, Texas, and New York (Table 7). By all three measures used in this report (percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly minority schools, percentage of Hispanic students in

90-100 percent minority schools, and percentage of whites in the class of a typical Hispanic student), New York is the most segregated state in the nation, and Texas, which educates more than a fourth of Hispanic children in the United States, is the second most segregated. California is experiencing very rapid increases in the segregation of its Hispanic students.

The most dramatic increases in segregation of Hispanic students between 1970 and 1980 took place in California, Illinois, and Florida (Table 8). Texas and New York were already highly segregated and became modestly more segregated during this peirod. Only two states, Colorado and Wyoming, had significant declines in segregation. In Colorado, this was probably due to the school desegregation order in Denver, the largest city in the state, which has more Chicano than black students. Wyoming, an energy boom state, had a large in-migration of white families.

The fact that the Hispanic enrollment is growing in states with high and increasing segregation suggests that the problem will become even more severe. Although there was a sharp decline in national public school enrollment in the seventies, California and Texas each had an increase of nearly 300,000 Hispanic students. Data for 1982 from Los Angeles suggest that the number of Hispanic students is still growing.

The changes mean that Hispanic children growing up in the 1980s will face quite different school situations than those growing up a decade more earlier. In California, Florida, and Illinois, for example, the typical Hispanic student in 1970 was in a one-half white school; by 1980, he was in a two-thirds minority school. Hispanic students are more and more likely to find themselves in schools with large numbers of the poor, the non-English speaking, and other minorities.

THE CITIES AND SEGREGATION

Although it is useful and interesting to compare regions and states, many of the decisions that determine educational integration take place within individual school districts or metropolitan areas. And what happens in one large city can affect more minority children than what happens in several small states.

Furthermore, because of residential segregation, minority families are often extraordinarily dependent on one or a handful of urban school districts within a state. Outside the South, both blacks and Hispanics are overwhelmingly urban residents, principally of central cities within large metropolitan areas. And as minority dependence on these districts has grown, white enrollments have declined.

Another reason for examining the big cities before turning our attention to entire metropolitan areas is that, since the late sixties, they have been at the center of most of the conflict over desegregation. Far-reaching progress against rural and small town segregation had been achieved by that time, and many small cities were in the process of peaceful desegregation. Since then, the political history of busing and school desegregation has revolved around big cities: Charlotte, Detroit, Richmond, Dayton, Columbus, Los Angeles, Denver, Cleveland, Seattle, and others. Cases in these cities have been the focus of Supreme Court decisions and civil rights efforts.

Sweeping conclusions about the feasibility and success of school desegregation have been drawn from community battles over implementation and the conflicting claims of school officials and various advocates about the results in their own cities. The decline of white enrollment in certain big cities after court-ordered desegregation, for example, has often been cited as proof that busing cannot work as a remedy and in fact has the long-term consequence of increasing racial separation.

Thus, to gain a better perspective on the issues raised, it is very important to review overall changes in the demographics of central-city school systems. The data permit some simple comparisons among city school districts of approximately similar size that have followed radically different desegregation policies, or no such policies at all. The data also permit examination of the different experiences of central-city-only school districts and districts that include both the central city and the suburbs.

Some of the most general patterns of big city changes in school district composition are evident in Table 9. The districts listed in that table serve almost 25 percent of the nation's black and Hispanic children but only 2 percent of white children.

Between 1968, when the systematic collection of national data began, and 1980, there was a clear and steady increase in the predominance of the minority student population in the largest city school systems. This trend held regardless of the region of the country or whether there was a school desegregation plan within the city schools. Six of the 10 largest districts were more than half minority by 1968, but none was as much as two-thirds minority. By 1980, all had more than two-thirds minority students, and most had at least three-fourths minority students. Interestingly, the change in racial composition was most rapid in several Sunbelt cities: Los Angeles, Houston, Dallas, and Miami.

A closer look at big city school districts that serve only the central-city portion of the metropolitan area shows a striking nationwide pattern of nonwhite majorities. Of the 50 school districts listed in Table 10, two-thirds had nonwhite majorities by 1980, and half of the remainder were rapidly moving in that direction. In other words, only about a sixth of these cities had reasonably secure white majorities. These were generally younger cities that

included areas which would be considered suburbs elsewhere or cities in states with few minority residents.

White Enrollment Decline in the Largest Districts. The percentage of whites in central-city school districts (Appendix B) has been declining for decades. Although in recent years, most attention has been focused on the decline of white enrollments following busing orders, statistics show that the proportions of whites in the largest districts in the United States--whether they have central-city or county-wide school systems--have been declining for twelve years. Virtually all large districts, regardless of whether they are desegregated or include both the city and the suburbs, have declining percentages of white enrollment. Indeed, because of the more rapid natural growth of minorities the total national percentage of whites enrolled in schools--private as well as public--is gradually declining.

There have been large declines in white enrollment percentages, both in systems with purely voluntary desegregation plans, such as Houston and San Diego, and in those with mandatory busing plans, such as Detroit and Memphis. A number of the districts that have become overwhelmingly minority were well on the way to this transition long before desegregation began. Desegregation plans may have varied the rate of change, but not the basic direction of change (see Table 10).

What does make a difference, according to these figures, is the scope of the district. In the five largest central-city-only school districts white enrollment percentages dropped sharply during this period. In the largest metropolitan districts, declines in white enrollment were less than half as large, despite the fact that most metropolitan districts were under far-reaching orders to bus for desegregation. What appears to be centrally important is not the student assignment plan but the degree to which the school

district encompassed the housing market area and thus made flight impractical. A number of the largest southern metropolitan areas were also still receiving a substantial net migration of whites, which aided stable desegregation.

Increases in Percent Black. The data on increases in black enrollment (See Appendix C) percentages in large districts are difficult to summarize and interpret. In contrast to the popular view, not all of the biggest increases in black enrollment occurred in inner cities, and not all of the inner city areas experienced rapid growth in the percentage of black enrollment. Some large central-city school districts have been experiencing declines in the numbers of black students in recent years; the percentages of black students have increased only because whites are leaving the city more rapidly than blacks and blacks have more children, on the average than whites. Some of the most rapid changes were in suburbs rather than cities. In a number of cities, the large increases in minority enrollment have been for Hispanic rather than black children.

The largest changes were in the city of Atlanta and two of its suburban counties; Prince George's County, outside Washington, D.C.; Detroit; Gary; Birmingham; Milwaukee; Memphis; and Flint, Michigan. Black enrollment in each of these jurisdictions increased by more than 20 percent. Atlanta, Detroit, Memphis, and Gary were overwhelmingly black school districts and were continuing to change. Detroit and Memphis had busing orders; Gary did not. Atlanta and its suburbs experienced rapid changes in spite of a political bargain that strictly limited busing in the hope of achieving stability. Prince George's County, Maryland, adjacent to a Washington, D.C. ghetto area, began to change very rapid racially in the late sixties and had a major busing order in 1972. In Memphis, where a busing plan was resisted bitterly and a parallel

"segregation academy" system of fundamentalist white schools was created, blacks enrollment increased by 21 percentage points between 1968 and 1980. Milwaukee, which has a moderately smaller school system, implemented a nationally acclaimed desegregation policy that relied on voluntary transfers to magnet schools without substantial resistance. The number of blacks in Milwaukee increased by 22 percentage points.

The cities and large metropolitan districts where the proportion of blacks increased less than 10 percent from 1968 to 1980 have very different compositions. The list includes some of the nation's largest urban school systems--New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Philadelphia. It includes Denver, the first northern school district ordered to implement busing by the Supreme Court. And it includes areas with the largest metropolitan busing plans in the United States--Tampa, Louisville, Las Vegas, Jacksonville, West Palm Beach, and St. Petersburg. Most of these areas had substantial migration of white families from the frostbelt.

Some districts had either no growth or declines in their black enrollment percentages, including San Francisco, Newark, and the southwestern cities of San Antonio, Tucson, and Corpus Christi. San Francisco, which probably has the nation's most diverse student population was one of the first cities outside the South to implement busing for desegregation, but the black proportion did not rise.

The statistics show that busing had only a modest and perhaps temporary effect on enrollment changes. The effects seem to be strongest in initial phases of busing in those central cities with large minority enrollments that are surrounded by white suburbs which are not included in the busing plan. The data also show that there are more basic influences on enrollment trends that operate strongly on the demography of cities regardless of whether there

is a school desegregation plan. The data also show that in many communities with little or no increases in the numbers of blacks, Hispanic enrollment is increasing as white enrollment falls.

Hispanic Enrollment in the Large Districts. The increases in the enrollment of Hispanic children in the nation's largest school districts, one of the most important trends from 1968 to 1980, was one of the major reasons for the national increases in Hispanic segregation. In Los Angeles, the Hispanic enrollment had increased from 20 percent in 1968 to 49 percent by 1982. A similar change occurred in Dade County, Miami. In Chicago, the proportion of Hispanic students more than doubled, reaching 20 percent as Hispanic children replaced whites. A very similar change took place in Dallas, and even more growth, from 13 percent to 28 percent occurred in Houston, which was the largest city in the South by 1980. Majority Hispanic districts, including El Paso, San Antonio, and Corpus Christi, experienced rapid increases in the Hispanic share of their total enrollment. Some older industrial cities that have become secondary migration centers for Hispanics experienced sharp increases from what had been very low percentage of Hispanic students. Boston, for example, had an increase from 3 percent in 1968 to 14 percent in 1980. Newark's Hispanic enrollment had increased to 20 percent by 1980 and Jersey City's to 29 percent.

One of the major contrasts between statistics for blacks and Hispanics is that there are many more major school districts with virtually no Hispanic children. At this point, the Hispanic population is still far more geographically concentrated than blacks or non-Hispanic whites. Most Hispanic school children are in California or Texas. The 1980 Census showed that close to half of the nation's Hispanic population was in 10 metropolitan areas, 3 of which are part of the Los Angeles urban complex. Table 11 shows changes in Hispanic enrollment in some of the largest city districts.

The enrollment trends show the emergence of some overwhelmingly Hispanic school districts and the development, in a number of the nation's largest urban areas of major school districts with two large and different minority populations. In some of these districts, the whites are already the third largest group of students and are rapidly losing ground. Urban educators in some cities must now deal with the problems of two major segregated and unequal minority communities. Black and Hispanic children, who may have very little contact with whites, face the need to work out relationships with each other. (In a few cities, very rapidly growing Asian immigrant settlements are introducing still further complexities.) As settlement patterns continue to develop, the list of large school districts confronting these challenges is likely to grow.

The Trends and the Future of Big City Education. The issues of segregation and equality for minority students have been on the agenda of big city educators for a generation, but the statistics in this report show that little progress has been achieved and that most segregation remains in the large cities. In fact, the large city school systems are now predominantly minority. The trends in the schools generally foretell trends in the cities as a whole and in the labor force and electorate. The trends show that race relations will be a central issue in tomorrow's cities of unprecedented racial diversity and separation.

There are signs, as well, that the changes that emerged in the big cities during the post-World War II period are now beginning to have large impacts on some suburban districts as well. Not only will many central-city school officials be forced to deal with another major minority group, but some suburban school districts that have always been all-white will confront sweeping changes.

The data on the largest districts point again to the importance of closely examining metropolitan area-wide desegregation plans, which diverge from the prevailing big city patterns in fundamental respects. Metropolitan school systems have the highest levels of integration and the greatest stability. Given the present composition of the large central-city districts and their well-established patterns of change, metropolitan approaches offer the only alternative for a growing list of cities like Washington, D. C., Atlanta, and Newark, where integration is impossible and where middle class minority families are rapidly following whites out of the city. Segregation by race is supplemented by segregation by class and intensified by the political boundaries that separate the segments of the population. Recent sharp cuts in federal and state aid to big city school districts have weakened the major mechanism that had been developed to deal with some of the consequences of racial and socio-economic transformations of central-city education.

Desegregation Levels in the Largest Systems. During the seventies, there were dramatic changes in the racial composition of schools in many central cities as a result of major demographic changes and a variety of desegregation plans. As shown in Table 12, among the largest urban districts, there have been widely varying changes in the average percentages of whites in the schools attended by the typical black student, ranging from an increase in white students of 72 percentage points to a decline of 19 percentage points. The changes depend on the residential patterns of the metropolitan area and the nature of the school desegregation plan adopted. In general, the greatest increases in integration of black students were in the big city districts that include much of what would elsewhere be called surburbia within their boundaries and that have sweeping busing orders. The declines in desegregation have been in central-city districts where there is either no desegregation plan or where an earlier plan was eroded by demographic changes.

A closer look at the demography of the largest districts of the southern and border states, almost all of which have desegregation orders or plans, shows the differential impact of the demographic changes on different sorts of school districts (see Table 13). The desegregation plans limited to central cities faced the same patterns of demographic change that affected cities across the nation. White enrollment, and thus the possibility of continuing integration, was far more stable in the county-wide districts with city-suburban busing than it was in the central-city-only districts without any significant mandatory desegregation (including Houston, New Orleans, and Baltimore). The next section shows that integration levels are much higher in these more stable metropolitan areas with county-wide school systems.

Black children in Washington, D.C., attend the most segregated big city schools in the United States. The school system is 94 percent black and only 3.4 percent white, and thus significant desegregation within the system is impossible. Eighty-three percent of the District's minority children were in schools where the white enrollment was 1 percent or less. Only 1 D.C. minority student in 200 was in a school that was as much as half white. The only large cities that came close to this level of segregation were Newark, Atlanta, and Chicago. The nation's capital had a predominantly black enrollment even when its schools were still segregated by law, and it is subject to the problems of separate city and suburban school districts more absolutely than other cities, because of its unique status outside any state.

Hispanic Enrollment in the Big Cities. Hispanic enrollment is rapidly becoming more important in the nation's largest school districts. In 5 of the 50 largest central-city school districts, Hispanics students were the largest single racial group by 1980: San Antonio Independent (74 percent), Corpus Christi (65 percent), El Paso (67 percent), Dade County (Miami), and Los

Angeles. In Los Angeles, which has the nation's second largest school district, the 1982-83 enrollment was 49 percent Hispanic, and the percentage of Hispanics is rapidly increasing.

The Hispanic enrollment (and the much smaller Asian enrollment) is growing much faster than the black or white enrollments nationally and in many school districts. Many big city systems have had declining white enrollments for years and recent drops in black enrollments as well. Migration, differential birth rates and age structures of the population, and continued white suburbanization all point toward a continuation of the pattern. In a number of large districts where blacks remain the dominant group, Hispanics are likely to overtake whites as the second largest group. In Chicago, for example, Latinos now comprise 20.4 percent of the enrollment, and as of fall 1982, there were only 16.3 percent whites.

METROPOLITAN DESEGREGATION PATTERNS

The basic unit of analysis for social trends in the Unites States is the metropolitan area. When one speaks of the Chicago economy, the Los Angeles housing market, the Atlanta power structure, the Houston transportation problem, or the pollution problem of any major city in the United States, the entire metropolitan area is being considered, not merely the central city. Most Americans live within metropolitan complexes, but most of the urban dwellers live outside the central cities. In a few areas, this is true for minority residents as well. We routinely receive data on metropolitan housing and job statistics and many other kinds of information simply because this is the basic unit of analysis for understanding many issues in American society. The federal government, however, has never released data comparing metropolitan areas on school desegregation problems and progress. We know that most remaining segregation is concentrated within big districts inside metropolitan areas. This makes it very important to compare the results in areas which have taken quite different approaches to desegregation.

The future of integration for currently segregated minority families will be determined largely by decisions about the future of schools and housing in large metropolitan areas. In Illinois, for example, more than two-thirds of all the black and Latino students in the state attend the Chicago public schools, which are among the nation's most segregated. Only about one-sixteenth of the whites in the state, however, attend Chicago schools. What happens within the school system in the Chicago metropolitan area will affect more minority families than anything else that can be done in the state. In fact, there are very few entire states that have as many black and Latino students as this one metropolitan area.

Although the federal government has periodically released data for central cities, it has not produced comparative statistics for metropolitan areas. In fact, its data collection system, which is set up to look at individual districts only for civil rights enforcement purposes, requires production of data from central cities but often omits many individual suburbs, particularly suburbs that have few minority students. The data collected are particularly inadequate for metropolitan areas with highly fragmented educational systems that include many small suburban districts. This pattern characterizes the older urban centers in the East and Midwest--areas that are often the centers of segregation in what are now the nation's most segregated states.

These problems with the federal data system, mean that we lack basic knowledge about segregation trends in some of our most important urban communities. And since the federal statistics are the only statistics collected nationally and serve as the basis for research and policy debate as well as civil rights activities, this is a very serious problem indeed. Using the current statistics, it is not possible, for example, to say anything about segregation trends in such vast urban areas as metropolitan New York or Chicago.

This report uses the federal data to assess and compare metropolitan desegregation trends in those areas where the information collected by the Department of Education is at least minimally adequate, which tend to be the less fragmented metropolitan communities of the South and West. Because so few large northern metropolitan areas can be analyzed, this study provides only a comparative analysis of metropolitan desegregation trends in the South and West.

The only metropolitan areas that can be studied are those on which the U.S Department of Education has racial data on for most of the students. To find out which areas these are, the 1980-81 Education Department data were compared with the total metropolitan public schol enrollments through a special tabulation by the National Center for Educational Statistics, which had total enrollments, but not racial data, for all districts from the previous school year. This report includes data only for those metro areas (SMSAs) in which the Education Department data are estimated to cover at least 70 percent of the total enrollment. Because the sample has always counted a considerably higher proportion of minority than white children, these statistics offer very strong coverage of minority children's experiences in terms of desegregation.

In order to avoid problems that could arise from reporting those measures of segregation which are highly sensitive to the percentage of white students counted, only one measure of segregation is used in this portion of the report. That measure, the exposure index, shows the percentages of white students in the schools attended by the typical black or Hispanic student in the metropolitan area. Since the sample includes the great majority of blacks and Hispanics and the schools they attend, this measure is the most reliable analysis of the existing federal data. And since desegregation policy is designed to rectify the segregation of minority youngsters, this is a useful and powerful measure to begin a comparative analysis.

Along with other data collection problems, the federal survey sampled different districts in different years within the suburbs. But since all the samples had the common feature of greatly oversampling districts with significant minority enrollments, this is not a fatal problem for this analysis. The statistics presented here should be accepted, however, as the best possible approximations rather than exact findings.

General Findings. Metropolitan areas include very large numbers of students, and a short list of the largest metropolitan areas, in terms of total enrollments, would include a very significant fraction of all students in the United States. In the 1980-81 school year, for example, more than a sixth of U.S. students went to schools in metropolitan New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Washington, D. C. All of these metropolitan areas had small white minorities and large numbers of segregated nonwhite children in their central-city school districts. None had a desegregation plan crossing city-suburban boundary lines; several had no significant desegregation at all. None of the 10 largest metropolitan areas had substantially desegregated public schools. Forty-two entire states have smaller enrollments than metropolitan New York, or metropolitan Los Angeles, or metropolitan Chicago. Obviously, progress toward desegregation or regression toward segregation in these large metropolitan regions and their smaller counterparts in other states deserves the most careful analysis.

There are extraordinary differences among metropolitan areas, even among those of relatively similar size and racial composition in the same region, and sometimes even in the same state. In some, there have been virtually no segregated schools for more than a decade, in others, there are very few integrated schools and hundreds of black, white, and Hispanic schools. Some entire urban communities have had little experience with segregation and now have an entire generation of students who have known integration as the norm. In others, racial isolation operates on a large scale and is more intense than it was a generation ago. According to research by Diana Pearce at Catholic University, those metropolitan areas in which schools have been desegregated are now experiencing considerably more housing integration than those which retained segregated schools. According to research by Robert

Crain of Johns Hopkins University and Rita Mahard of the University of Michigan, city-suburban plans produce dramatically greater educational gains for black students than central-city-only plans. If the very wide differences among urban areas continue and further research confirms the broad impacts of these different approaches, the future may be one of widely divergent metropolitan societies with very different kinds of race relations.

Metropolitan Areas in the Southern and Border States. The southern and border state area is most interesting for analysis of metropolitan trends for several reasons. First, the data are most complete, and it is possible to look at trends in most large metropolitan areas. Second, it is the only region that has had a considerable number of metropolitan areas with region-wide desegregation for a number of years. Third, in the South, many suburbs as well as central cities have significant minority populations and some kind of desegregation plan. Fourth, almost all the metropolitan areas, unlike many in the North, have a substantial minority population. Fifth, the southern states include a number of the most important sunbelt cities, whose development will do much to influence race relations in the United States for decades to come. Unlike older and declining metropolitan areas, these rapidly growing communities still have many fundamental choices to make about the educational and residential patterns of their metropolitan regions.

It is important to note one source of possible confusion before looking at the data on southern metropolitan areas. A number of the same metropolitan areas were discussed in the analysis of big cities. In that section, however, the data were limited to single districts. Although some of these large districts were county-wide and happen to include most students in the metropolitan area, many included only the central city or part of the suburban ring, and none were larger than a single county. This section, in contrast,

combines data from all the individual school districts surveyed within Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas as defined by the Bureau of the Census. Typically, each SMSA includes a central city and the adjacent counties that have experienced significant suburbanization. (Los Angeles is a major exception, the Census Bureau limits its SMSA to Los Angeles County and breaks its outlying suburban ring into several other SMSAs.) Many SMSAs include several counties and large numbers of independent school districts. Thus, even though the name of the central city is used in the text and tables of this section to identify the metropolitan area, the statistics refer to very different units of analysis from those in the preceeding section.

Among the large southern and border state metropolitan areas for which we have adequate data, the racial composition of the schools attended by the typical black student ranges from a low of less than one-fifth white enrollment in the Miami and New Orleans SMSAs to more than two-thirds white enrollment in the Tampa, Louisville, and Wilmington SMSAs (Table 14). In the relatively small number of large SMSAs with at least 5 percent Hispanic population, the range is more narrow. Hispanic students have the most contact with whites in the Austin and West Palm Beach districts and the least in the heavily Hispanic Texas SMSAs of McAllen, El Paso, and San Antonio.

As shown in Table 15, the largest increases in desegregation for black students occurred in Louisville, Tampa, Wilmington, and Oklahoma City. The largest increase in segregation was in Miami. Among Hispanic students, the only substantial increase in metropolitan desegregation in an area with more than 5 percent Hispanics was in Austin, and the largest declines in the percentages of whites were in metropolitan Miami and Houston.

The relationship between desegregation policy and actual level of desegregation accomplished is obvious in these tables. All of the areas with the

highest levels of desegregation for blacks have extensive city-suburban busing orders, and two of the leaders in change during the seventies have had court orders forcing merger and desegregation of previously independent city and suburban school systems (Louisville and Wilmington). The major reduction in segregation for Hispanics came in Austin, which recently implemented a major desegregation order—one of the few major busing orders with an explicit goal of desegregating Hispanics. If one compares Richmond, where the federal courts rejected city-suburban desegregation, with metropolitan areas that have city-suburban plans, the differences are clearly apparent. In metropolitan Richmond, in spite of desegregation plans within separate parts of the metropolitan area, the typical black student is in a school that is almost three-fourths black, and the level of integration dropped from 1970 to 1980. In Atlanta, where the Supreme Court recently rejected a city-suburban plan, black students are even more segregated than in Richmond, and segregation also increased slightly during the seventies. One need only compare those figures with data from major southern and border districts that have metropolitan plans to note the striking differences in results. Metropolitan school desegregation orders have had a pronounced and lasting impact on segregation.

Desegregation orders limited to central cities have been highly successful only in cases where a central city contains much of the metropolitan population and a relatively high percentage of white students. For example, in Austin and Oklahoma City, the two cities where orders limited to the central city had most impact, use of 1980 had more than half of the students were white in contrast to many other, largely minority big city districts in the region.

One of the important developments in the South, which is evident in these data but has not received serious attention previously, is the emergence of

some metropolitan areas where a majority of all of the public school students are from "minority" groups. Memphis and New Orleans, for example, have black majorities even on a metropolitan basis. Most of the metropolitan areas of South Texas have Hispanic majorities. Some major metropolitan areas outside the South either have or are moving toward nonwhite majorities. In a few metropolitan areas, particularly those near the Mexican border in Texas, even the most far-reaching metropolitan plan would leave many minority students in predominantly minority schools. There is a need for serious thought about what the goals of desegregation should be in such a setting, and how its progress should be measured. These questions will become increasingly important as some of the major metropolitan areas in California and elsewhere become predominantly minority in public school enrollment. For the time being, it is important to note that the statistics on segregation in some metropolitan regions reflect not merely a failure to develop desegregation policies but also some extraordinary demographic obstacles to full integration.

Overall the metropolitan trends in the South are strongly related to different kinds of desegregation plans. City-suburban plans and plans in predominantly white big city districts have produced high levels of desegregation, which have remained high even years after the court order. In large SMSAs with predominantly minority central-city school districts, there has been much less progress in integration for minority children, whether or not there has been a desegregation plan. There has been little progress in desegregating Hispanic students on a metropolitan basis anywhere in the region, with the single exception Austin.

Metropolitan Segregation and Desegregation in the West. The West, the only other region where the data permit some comparative analyses of the large SMSAs, is different from the southern and border areas in key respects. Its

dominant minority is Hispanic, not black. Western Hispanics are rapidly becoming more segregated, in contrast to the large increases in desegregation for southern blacks. California dominates the region's statistics in a way not true for any southern state, thus California's metropolitan areas are of decisive importance for the region's black and Hispanic populations, which are both very highly urbanized.

Among the large metropolitan areas surveyed, only the Denver SMSA had a decline in segregation of both black and Hispanic students during the 1970s. Denver, which was ordered to desegregate as the result of the Supreme Court's first busing decision outside the South in 1973, has a plan designed to desegregate both groups.

The largest increases in the percentages of whites in the schools of the typical black student during the 1970s were in Las Vegas (up 14.5 percent) and Denver (up 10.2 percent). The Las Vegas (Clark County) desegregation plan is the only large metropolitan plan in the West. Most of the western metropolitan areas did, however, modestly reduce segregation of black students during the decade (see Table 16). One reason for the progress was the much smaller black enrollment percentages in many western metropolitan areas than in their counterparts in the South and the older industrial states.

Segregation of Hispanics increased in all of the SMSAs listed in Table 17, except in Denver and Tucson, where there were slight gains in integration. Denver and Tucson both had school desegregation orders.

The most dramatic declines in the percentages of whites in the schools of the typical Hispanic student occurred in the urban corridor of Southern California (San Diego, Orange, and Los Angeles counties, where there was massive Chicano migration. The typical metropolitan Los Angeles student had been in a 45 percent white school in 1970 but was in a 78 percent minority school by

1980. In Orange and San Diego counties, where the Hispanic percentages were much lower, the typical Hispanic student was in a school that was more than 66 percent white in 1970 but in a predominantly minority school by 1980. Los Angeles had a limited school desegregation plan, but the mandatory portions were dismantled in 1981. San Diego had a small voluntary plan limited to the central city. There were no court orders in Orange County.

Most of the major urban centers of California and the Pacific Northwest are experiencing not only substantial growth of Hispanic population but also large increases in the number of Asian children. Indeed, the San Francisco school district has far more Asian than black, white, or Latino students. When these migration trends are combined with the region's low white birth rate and the residential segregation of blacks and Hispanics, it is not difficult to understand the growing likelihood that, in the absence of strong and effective desegregation policies, minority children will find themselves in schools with few whites.

In fact, not only are minority children, except Asians, highly segregated from whites, but there is a substantial tendency for each of the minorities in these cosmopolitan cities to be segregated from each other as well. The San Francisco desegregation plan aims at creating multi-ethnic schools, and civil rights lawyers in Los Angeles urged a plan that would have a similar goal. Obviously, these will be important questions in metropolitan areas where a substantial majority of the school children will be from an assortment of minority groups.

In a number of the western metropolitan areas where segregation was addressed through a plan limited to the central city, the segregation trends produced by continuing white suburbanization, neighborhood resegregation, and continuing in-migration of minority families are gradually diminishing the

level of integration for minority children. This is apparent now, for example, in Sacramento. In the long run, these forces will raise the question of city-surburban desegregation in the West if substantial integration is to be maintained.

In most instances, the western metropolitan regions studied here have shown significant progress in reducing the segregation of blacks, the region's second largest minority. However, Hispanics, the largest group of minority students, have become substantially more segregated. In the West, unlike the South, desegregation orders are far from universal even within central cities, and city-suburban desegregation on a large scale exists only in Las Vegas, an area which has levels of integration comparable to the highest in the South. The region's demographic trends foretell increasing segregation of minority children and increasing difficulties in holding on to the achievements of the past generation in those SMSAs with city-only plans and large minority enrollments. Perhaps the leaders of urban education in the West should examine the experiences of metropolitan areas in the South.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first report of this project, submitted to the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights in September 1982, showed the major progress that was achieved in southern desegregation from 1968 to 1980 and suggested that the difference between that record and the much slower change in the North was due in part to the much stronger enforcement of civil rights policies in the southern and border states. An important finding was the clear evidence of increasing segregation of Hispanic children in all parts of the United States. By changing from a broad regional overview to a more focused look at states, metropolitan areas, and big urban districts, this report allows some interpretation of the reasons for the extremely wide variation among different states and urban areas in the same region. The analysis strongly suggests that the key problems of segregation facing the nation are in the cities, and that the central reasons for success in reducing segregation drastically in some states and metropolitan areas have been implementation of desegregation plans on a city-suburban basis or on a city-wide basis in the small minority of big city school districts that still retain white majorities and serve a large fraction of the metropolitan population.

The findings of this project, I believe, support the following recommendations:

1) Racial data on all school districts in metropolitan areas should be regularly collected and released.

   Even with the cooperation of the Department of Education, it has been impossible to do any serious analysis of segregation trends in the largest urban areas of the eastern and midwestern states where segregation is most intense. It is impossible to develop good research and policy analysis without such basic data.

2) The implications of increasing segregation of Hispanic students and the impact on Hispanics of various forms of desegregationshould be seriously investigated.

Extremely little governmental or scholarly attention has been devoted to the rapid increase in the segregation of this very large and expanding minority group. If the consequences turn out to be anything like those produced by segregation of black education, this neglect may be similar to the failure of northern educators to address questions of ghetto education throughout its formative period in the early twentieth century. Certainly we should begin as soon as possible to evaluate the consequences and the possible remedies.

3. City-suburban desegregation plans should be encouraged and supported.

   Since the enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act there has been no positive action by Congress to encourage or require desegregation, except for the financial aid granted by the Emergency School Aid Act, which was repealed in 1981. Congress should reinstate that important program, which funded educational and training components of desegregation plans but not busing. It should offer special assistance for voluntary or court-ordered city-suburban desegregation.

4. Housing desegregation policy should be strengthened.

   One of the clear implications of statistics showing increases in segregation in areas without strong busing policies is that policies intended to diminish residential segregation are not working. Strengthening the very weak federal fair housing law, developing policies in support of integrated neighborhoods, and requiring administration of housing programs in a way that contributes to rather than undermines school integration could provide real support for school desegregation while taking some of the burdens of change off the courts and local educators.

Table 1. Percentage of black students in schools more than 50 percent white, 1968 and 1980.

State	Black enrollment, 1980	Percentage of black students in predominantly white schools		Change in percentage points, 1968-1980
		1968	1980	
NY	484,286	32.31	23.26	- 9.05
TX	408,747	25.25	36.01	10.76
IL	403,061	13.62	20.55	6.93
CA	400,675	22.49	24.67	2.18
GA	359,888	14.03	39.89	25.86
FL	348,768	23.21	60.35	37.14
NC	329,724	28.31	64.04	35.73
LA	322,985	8.89	34.21	25.32
MI	314,204	20.60	18.14	- 2.46
SC	262,110	14.19	40.12	25.93
VA	257,657	26.90	42.27	15.37
AL	249,734	8.29	44.28	35.99
OH	249,485	27.74	41.14	13.40
MD	231,590	31.11	32.78	1.67
PA	231,331	27.52	29.27	1.75
MS	228,251	6.71	23.56	16.85
NJ	226,814	33.88	23.29	- 10.56
TN	204,014	21.25	36.73	15.48
MO	113,357	24.56	36.35	11.79
IN	102,317	29.98	38.14	8.16
DC	97,962	.90	.91	.01
AR	92,227	22.61	42.17	19.56
KY	59,611	53.72	91.12	37.40
MA	56,675	51.24	43.99	- 7.25
CT	53,943	43.32	42.06	- 1.26
WI	50,740	22.54	46.54	24.00
OK	48,173	37.81	65.71	27.90
KS	29,159	53.44	70.96	17.52
WA	25,989	64.23	76.38	12.15
CO	25,203	30.52	53.05	22.53
DE	24,900	54.23	95.14	40.91
AZ	20,346	33.41	43.82	10.41
MN	16,763	78.97	94.48	15.51
NV	14,747	82.03	94.50	12.47
NE	13,434	27.26	78.21	50.95
IA	11,446	73.11	96.65	23.54
OR	9,482	63.26	75.11	11.85
RI	6,642	89.42	77.10	- 12.32
NM	5,927	47.94	58.07	10.13

Table 2. Percentage of Hispanic students in schools more than 50 percent white, 1968 and 1980.

State	Hispanic enrollment, 1980	Percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly white schools 1968	1980	Change in percentage points, 1968-1980
CA	1,002,188	60.97	32.07	- 28.90
TX	864,300	27.57	21.76	- 5.81
NY	325,532	17.56	17.76	0.20
NM	125,779	26.70	24.75	- 1.95
IL	117,790	52.76	34.73	- 18.03
FL	117,562	49.95	30.26	- 19.69
AZ	116,644	47.95	37.69	- 10.26
NJ	98,041	44.04	23.54	- 20.50
CO	84,281	63.32	67.07	3.75
CT	30,431	48.68	36.29	- 12.39
WA	30,428	87.86	60.01	- 27.85
MA	30,098	75.09	50.44	- 24.65
UT	12,012	88.07	96.89	8.82
OR	11,949	99.37	98.22	- 1.15
KS	11,237	92.48	86.00	- 6.48
ID	9,737	99.52	99.79	0.27
NV	7,786	99.45	94.08	- 5.37
WY	5,322	78.25	94.87	16.62
RI	2,973	63.88	69.56	5.68

Table 3. Increase in percentage of black students attending majority white schools, border and southern states, 1968-1980.

State	1968-1980 increase in percentage of state's black students in predominantly white schools	1980 percentage of black students in predominantly white schools
Delaware	40.9	95.1
Kentucky	37.4	91.1
Florida	37.1	60.3
Alabama	36.0	44.3
North Carolina	35.7	64.0
Oklahoma	27.9	65.7
South Carolina	25.9	40.1
Georgia	25.9	39.9
Louisiana	25.3	34.2
Arkansas	19.6	42.2
Mississippi	16.9	23.6
Tennessee	15.5	36.7
Virginia	15.4	42.3
West Virginia	12.5	94.5
Missouri	11.8	36.4
Texas	10.8	36.0
Maryland	1.7	32.8
District of Columbia	0.0	.9
TOTAL SOUTH	23.8	42.9
TOTAL BORDER	12.4	40.8
NATIONAL TOTAL	13.7	37.1

Table 4. Exposure rate for blacks (percentage of white students in the school of a typical black student), 1970-1980 (states with at least 5 percent black students).

State	Percentage black enrollment	Exposure rate 1970	1980	Change in percentage points, 1970-1980
NE	5.6%	32.6	65.5	32.9
KY	8.7	49.4	74.3	24.9
DE	25.9	46.5	68.5	22.0
WI	6.2	25.7	44.5	18.8
OK	9.3	42.1	57.6	15.5
OH	13.1	28.4	43.2	14.8
MO	13.6	21.4	34.1	12.7
NV	9.5	55.7	68.4	12.7
TN	24.0	29.2	38.0	8.8
IN	9.9	31.1	38.7	7.6
KS	7.8	51.6	59.1	7.5
FL	23.4	43.2	50.6	7.4
AL	33.1	32.7	39.7	7.0
VA	25.5	41.5	47.4	5.9
MD	30.6	30.3	35.4	5.1
NC	29.6	49.0	54.0	5.0
TX	14.4	30.7	35.2	4.5
IL	20.9	14.6	19.0	4.4
AR	22.5	42.5	46.5	4.0
GA	33.5	35.1	38.3	3.2
MA	6.2	47.5	50.4	2.9
CA	10.1	25.6	27.7	2.1
LA	41.5	30.8	32.8	2.0
SC	42.8	41.2	42.7	1.5
PA	12.4	27.8	29.3	1.5
MI	17.9	21.9	22.5	0.6
MS	51.0	29.6	29.2	- 0.4
DC	93.4	2.2	1.5	- 0.7
CT	10.2	44.1	40.3	- 3.8
NJ	18.5	32.4	26.4	- 6.0
NY	17.9	29.2	23.0	- 6.2

Table 5. States with highest black enrollment and highest levels of segregation of black students according to three measures, 1980.

Black percentage of total enrollment	Percentage of black students in predominantly minority schools	Percentage of black students in 90-100 percent minority schools	White percentage of enrollment in school of typical black student*
MS	MI	IL	IL
SC	IL	NY	MI
LA	NY	MI	NY
GA	NJ	NJ	NJ
AL	MS	PA	GA
MD	CA	MO	MS
NC	PA	CA	PA
DE	MD	LA	LA
VA	LA	MS	MO
TN	TX	IN	TX

* Lowest percentage represents greatest segregation; thus states in this column are ranked in order of increasing percentage. That is, Illinois has the smallest percentage of white students in the school of a typical black.

Table 6. States with largest Hispanic enrollment, 1980.

State	Hispanic enrollment	Percentage of national total Hispanic enrollment	Increase in enrollment, 1970-1980	Percentage of Hispanic students in 90-100% minority schools
CA	1,002,188	31.52	295,260	22.2
TX	864,300	27.18	298,586	39.8
NY	325,532	10.24	8,944	56.8
NM	125,779	3.95	16,465	17.1
IL	117,790	3.70	39,705	32.3
FL	117,562	3.69	51,749	25.2

Table 7. States with highest Hispanic enrollment and highest levels of segregation of Hispanic students according to three measures, 1980.

Hispanic percentage of total enrollment	Percentage of Hispanic students in predominantly minority schools	Percentage of Hispanic students in 90-100 percent minority schools	White percentage of enrollment in school of typical Hispanic student*
NM	NY	NY	NY
TX	TX	TX	TX
CA	NJ	NJ	NJ
AZ	NM	IL	NM
CO	FL	PA	FL
NY	CA	FL	CA
NJ	IL	CT	IL
FL	CT	CA	CT
IL	AZ	NM	PA
CT	PA	AZ	AZ

* Lowest percentage represents greatest segregation; thus states in this column are ranked in order of increasing percentage. That is, New York has the smallest percentage of white students in the school of a typical Hispanic.

Table 8. Exposure rate for Hispanics (percentage of white students in the school of a typical Hispanic student), 1970-1980 (states with at least 5 percent Hispanic students).

State	Percentage Hispanic enrollment	Exposure rate 1970	1980	Change in percentage points, 1970-1980
CA	25.3	54.4	35.9	-18.5
IL	6.1	50.0	36.4	-13.6
FL	7.9	46.4	35.3	-11.1
CT	5.8	47.8	37.9	- 9.9
NJ	8.0	38.2	29.6	- 8.6
NV	5.2	83.7	75.3	- 8.4
NM	46.5	36.9	32.6	- 4.3
TX	30.4	31.1	27.7	- 3.4
AZ	24.2	45.5	43.5	- 2.0
NY	12.0	21.6	20.8	- .8
CO	15.3	56.8	59.0	+ 2.2
WY	5.3	75.3	82.8	+7.5

Table 9. Decline in enrollment of white students in selected large city school districts, 1968-1980.

City	Decline in number of white students	Percentage decline in number of whites
New York City	213,675	45.7
Los Angeles	222,522	63.4
Chicago	136,213	62.1
Philadelphia	45,096	41.2
Detroit	90,331	77.8
Houston	82,288	62.8
Dallas	58,929	60.2
Baltimore	38,830	58.0
Memphis	31,831	54.6
San Diego*	37,209	37.9
Washington,D.C.	4,957	59.9
Milwaukee	55,350	58.2
New Orleans	24,608	71.0
Cleveland	43,946	66.3
Atlanta	36,420	85.7
Boston	40,819	63.3
Denver	37,188	58.7

* Only predominantly white school district on list.

Table 10. Total enrollment and racial composition of the 50 largest central-city school districts, 1980.

District	Total enrollment	% black	% white	% Hispanic	% Asian
1. New York	931,193	39%	26%	31%	4%
2. Los Angeles	538,038	23%	24%	45%	7%
3. Chicago	445,269	60%	19%	19%	2%
4. Miami (Dade Co.) *	232,951	30%	32%	38%	1%
5. Philadelphia	224,152	63%	29%	7%	1%
6. Detroit	211,886	86%	12%	2%	0%
7. Houston	194,060	45%	25%	28%	2%
8. Baltimore	129,979	78%	21%	0%	0%
9. Dallas	129,305	49%	30%	19%	1%
10. Memphis	110,113	75%	24%	0%	0%
11. San Diego	109,793	15%	56%	18%	11%
12. Washington	104,907	93%	4%	2%	1%
13. Milwaukee	87,826	46%	45%	6%	1%
14. New Orleans	85,707	84%	12%	1%	3%
15. Cleveland	80,074	67%	28%	4%	1%
16. Albuquerque	78,051	3%	53%	39%	1%
17. Columbus	73,094	39%	59%	0%	1%
18. Atlanta	72.295	91%	8%	0%	0%
19. Boston	67,366	46%	35%	14%	5%
20. Fort Worth	66,170	37%	44%	18%	1%
21. Indianapolis	65,958	50%	49%	0%	0%
22. Denver	64,274	23%	41%	32%	3%
23. St. Louis	61,474	79%	21%	0%	0%
24. El Paso	61,285	4%	28%	67%	1%
25. San Antonio	60,695	15%	11%	74%	0%
26. Newark	59,658	70%	9%	20%	0%
27. San Francisco	59,385	27%	17%	16%	40%
28. Tucson	55,654	5%	62%	29%	2%
29. Austin	55,369	19%	53%	27%	1%
30. Cincinnati	53,632	57%	42%	0%	0%
31. Portland	52,868	14%	76%	2%	7%
32. Tulsa	49,454	23%	69%	1%	1%
33. Seattle	49,156	22%	56%	4%	15%
34. Oakland	48,863	66%	14%	10%	9%
35. Buffalo	48,236	47%	47%	4%	0%
36. Fresno	47,770	12%	54%	31%	3%
37. Birmingham	46,523	76%	24%	0%	0%
38. Pittsburgh	46,239	50%	49%	0%	1%
39. Toledo	45,488	33%	62%	4%	1%
40. Wichita	44,921	19%	72%	4%	3%
41. Omaha	44,719	25%	70%	2%	1%
42. Minneapolis	42,797	21%	69%	1%	4%
43. Oklahoma City	41,185	35%	55%	4%	2%
44. Sacramento	39,873	22%	46%	17%	13%
45. Akron	38,926	35%	64%	0%	0%
46. Kansas City	38,279	67%	28%	4%	1%
47. Norfolk	37,471	58%	39%	1%	3%
48. Corpus Christi	37,383	6%	28%	65%	0%
49. St. Paul	37,051	13%	74%	5%	6%
50. Ft. Wayne	34,716	20%	77%	2%	1%

* For the purposes of this table, Dade County is considered as the central city of the South Florida urban complex.

Table 11. Hispanic enrollment in selected large districts, 1968-1980

District	1968	1980	Difference
New York	23%	31%	8%
Los Angeles	20%	45% 49*	25% 29*
Chicago	9%	19% 20*	10% 11*
Miami (Dade County)	17%	38%	21%
San Antonio	58%	74%	16%
Houston	13%	28%	15%

* 1982-83 data

Table 12. Change in the percentage of white students in the school of the typical black student, 1968-1980.

District	Change
St. Petersburg FL	+57
Greenville SC	+54
Winston-Salem NC	+48
Oklahoma City	+40
Ft Lauderdale FL	+38
Jacksonville FL	+36
Omaha NB	+35
Wichita KS	+34
Charlotte NC	+33
Nashville TN	+31
W. Palm Beach FL	+28
Columbus OH	+28
Dayton OH	+28
Mobile ALA	+21
Denver CO	+21
Cleveland OH	+20
Tulsa OK	+20
Milwaukee WS	+19
Little Rock AS	+19
Charleston SC	+18
Fresno CA	+18
Sacramento CA	-19
Anaheim CA	-18
Paterson NJ	-17
Jersey City	-16
New Haven CT	-14
Gary IND	-13
Hartford	-12
Providence RI	-12
San Francisco CA	-11
Riverside CA	-11
NYC	-10
Bridgeport	- 9
El Paso TX	- 9
Oakland	- 6
Flint MI	- 6
Newark NJ	- 5
Detroit MI	- 4
Long Beach CA	- 4
St. Paul MN	- 4
Springfield MA	- 4

Table 13. Percentage of white enrollment in the largest school districts in the southern and border states, 1968-1980.

District	1968	1974	1980	Change in percentage points, 1968-1980
Dade Co.*	58	44	32	-18%
Houston	53	39	25	-28%
Broward+	80	76	72	- 8%
Dallas	61	45	30	-31%
Baltimore	35	27	21	-14%
Fairfax	97	95	86	-11%
Prince George's	85	67	46	-39%
Hillsborough+	74	74	75	+1%
Memphis	46	29	24	-22%
Montgomery Co.	94	89	78	-16%
Jefferson Co, KY+	80	94	72	- 8%
Duval Co.+	72	67	63	- 9%
Baltimore Co.	96	93	86	-10%
Washington	6	3	4	- 2%
Pinellas+	83	83	83	- 1%
New Orleans	32	19	12	-20%
Orange Co. FLA.+	93	78	72	-21%
Charlotte+	71	66	60	-11%
Atlanta	38	15	8	-30%
W. Palm Beach+	70	66	63	- 7%
Nashville+	76	71	65	-11%
Ann Arundel	86	86	84	- 2%
Fort Worth	67	55	44	-23%

* Dade County has a county-wide plan which leaves some black areas segregated and often "desegregates" by combining two minorities--blacks and Hispanics in minority schools.

+ city-suburban desegregation orders

Table 14. Integregation levels for black and Hispanic students in the largest surveyed metropolitan areas in southern and border states, 1980.

Metropolitan Area	Percentage of whites in school attended by typical black student	Percentage of whites in school attended by typical Hispanic student
Washington, D.C.	24.7	+
Houston, TX.	20.1	37.2
Atlanta	22.3	+
Baltimore	24.3	+
Miami	17.9	24.4
Tampa	72.4	+
San Antonio	27.0	20.8
New Orleans	19.6	+
Memphis	20.8	+
Norfolk	44.9	+
Birmingham	24.1	+
Jacksonville	49.7	+
Greensboro, NC	60.1	+
Orlando, FL	53.6	+
Louisville, KY	67.9	+
Nashville, TN	55.9	+
Oklahoma City, OK	55.5	+
El Paso, TX	*	17.3
Richmond, VA	28.3	+
Greenville, SC	65.3	+
Baton Rouge, LA	29.2	+
Mobile, AL	34.9	+
Charleston, SC	34.1	+
Wilmington, DE	67.8	+
Shreveport, LA	30.5	+
West Palm Beach, FL	44.3	55.2
Austin, TX	45.0	46.1
Little Rock, AR	49.9	+
Columbia, SC	34.6	+
Augusta, GA	46.3	+
McAllen, TX	*	7.1

* less than 5 percent black enrollment

+ less than 5 percent Hispanic enrollment

Table 15. Changes in integration levels for black and Hispanic students in the largest surveyed metropolitan areas in the southern and border states, 1970-1980.

Metropolitan Area	Change in percentage of whites in school attended by typical black student	Change in percentage of whites in school attended by typical Hispanic student
Washington, D.C.	+7.6	-20.4+
Houston, Tx.	+ .9	- 8.4
Atlanta	- .8	-20.3+
Baltimore	+5.4	- 8.6+
Miami	-8.1	-14.1
Tampa	+36.8	- 2.8+
San Antonio	+ 4.7	- 0.9
New Orleans	+ 2.4	- 5.3+
Memphis	+ 7.1	-15.7+
Norfolk	+11.1	-10.5+
Birmingham	+ 2.6	-13.5+
Jacksonville	+19.4	-14.8+
Greensboro, N.C.	+18.6	-13.1+
Orlando, Fl.	+ 9.3	- 9.0+
Louisville, Ky.	+43.0	-13.2+
Nashville, Tn.	+18.8	-14.6+
Oklahoma, Ok.	+33.1	-23.4+
El Paso, Tx.	-6.4*	- 3.2
Richmond, Va.	-1.2	- 8.2+
Greenville, S.C.	-5.1	- 4.9+
Baton Rouge, La.	+2.6	0.0+
Mobile, Al.	+5.9	+ 1.0+
Charleston, S.C.	+4.6	- 7.4+
Wilmington, De.	+35.5	+18.4+
Shreveport, La.	+4.6	- 6.3+
West Palm Beach, Fl.	+11.6	- 7.1
Austin, Tx.	+25.4	+12.4
Little Rock, Ar	+14.0	- 9.8+
Columbia, S.C.	-4.9	-23.2+
Augusta, Ga.	+ 9.7	-23.3+
McAllen, Tx.	-2.5*	- 6.7

* less than one twentieth of metropolitan enrollment is black

+ less than one twentieth of metropolitan enrollment is Hispanic

Table 16. Segregation of black students in selected western metropolitan areas with enrollments over 50,000 and more than 5 percent black, 1970-1980.

Metropolitan Area	Percentage of whites in school of typical black student 1970	1980	Change in percentage points, 1970-1980
Los Angeles	13.7	16.1	2.4
San Francisco-Oakland	27.0	23.3	-3.7
Fresno	29.9	35.8	5.9
Phoenix	29.1	36.3	7.2
San Diego	35.7	42.5	6.8
Sacramento	60.7	50.0	-10.7
Denver	40.0	50.2	10.2
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa	64.7	50.7	-14.0
Seattle	52.3	56.5	4.2
Riverside	59.2	57.0	-2.2
Colorado Springs	63.1	67.9	4.8
Las Vegas	53.5	68.0	14.5
Tacoma	77.1	71.6	-5.5

Table 17. Segregation of Hispanic students in selected western metropolitan areas with enrollments over 50,000 and more than 10 percent Hispanic, 1970-1980.

Metropolitan Area	Percentage of whites in school of typical Hispanic student 1970	1980	Change in percentage points, 1970-1980
Los Angeles	44.9	21.8	-23.1
Albuquerque	39.2	36.3	-2.9
Tucson	38.2	38.3	.1
Fresno	49.0	39.3	-9.7
San Francisco-Oakland	61.5	44.6	-16.9
San Diego	67.4	45.2	-22.2
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove	72.8	48.7	-24.1
Phoenix	50.8	50.1	- .7
Riverside	63.1	54.5	-8.6
Denver	55.6	55.8	.2
Sacramento	70.0	56.5	-13.5
Modesto	78.5	62.0	-16.5
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa	78.5	66.8	-11.7
Las Vegas	81.9	70.6	-11.3
Colorado Springs	72.0	71.7	- .3

Appendix A. School Segregation by State, 1980.

State	Percentage of black students in 90-100 percent minority schools	Percentage of Hispanic students in 90-100 percent minority schools	Percentage of whites in school of typical black	Percentage of whites in school of typical Hispanic
ALABAMA	31.9	1.3	39.7	77.3
ALASKA	.1	.6	73.6	75.8
ARIZONA	14.0	12.8	44.2	43.5
ARKANSAS	5.1	0	46.5	80.4
CALIFORNIA	41.4	22.2	27.7	35.9
COLORADO	.5	1.6	54.2	59.0
CONNECTICUT	32.0	24.9	40.3	37.9
DELEWARE	.8	0	68.5	63.4
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	95.9	23.1	1.5	17.9
FLORIDA	17.4	25.2	50.6	35.3
GEORGIA	25.8	2.3	38.3	68.9
HAWAII	5.6	11.9	44.5	26.9
IDAHO	0	0	86.4	85.4
ILLINOIS	67.7	32.3	19.0	36.4
INDIANA	34.7	24.6	38.7	52.1
IOWA	0	0	78.7	88.7
KANSAS	9.9	2.9	59.1	72.5
KENTUCKY	0	0	74.3	87.1
LOUISIANA	36.9	4.9	32.8	60.8
MAINE	0	0	97.3	97.5

MARYLAND	30.3	.8	35.4	67.4
MASSACHUSETTS	1.7	4.5	50.4	52.6
MICHIGAN	51.0	3.0	22.5	70.6
MINNESOTA	0	.2	69.9	84.1
MISSISSIPPI	36.7	6.8	29.2	56.7
MISSOURI	44.2	.5	34.1	72.7
MONTANA	.2	0	90.2	85.5
NEBRASKA	1.9	.1	65.5	84.0
NEVADA	5.8	.4	68.4	75.3
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	95.5	95.9
NEW JERSEY	50.0	34.9	26.4	29.6
NEW MEXICO	4.7	17.1	49.6	32.6
NEW YORK	56.2	56.8	23.0	20.8
NORTH CAROLINA	4.8	.8	54.0	66.2
NORTH DAKOTA	0	0	89.6	93.7
OHIO	14.7	.9	43.2	68.8
OKLAHOMA	7.7	1.6	57.6	71.8
OREGON	0	0	66.6	83.9
PENNSYLVANIA	49.0	28.8	29.3	43.4
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	65.8	61.5
SOUTH CAROLINA	14.3	1.0	42.7	67.9
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	0	89.9	88.8

TENNESSEE	29.8	.5	38.0	82.4
TEXAS	33.9	39.8	35.2	27.7
UTAH	0	0	77.9	82.8
VERMONT	0	0	98.5	98.5
VIRGINIA	4.9	0	47.4	75.1
WASHINGTON	1.4	.1	66.9	63.5
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	78.7	91.8
WISCONSIN	21.2	2.2	44.5	65.2
WYOMING	0	0	77.8	82.8

Appendix B. Districts percentage of white enrollment, 1968-1980.

District	1968	1974		Total change in percentage points, 1968-1980
NYC	44%	31%	26%	-18%
LA	54	42	24	-30
Chicago	38	28	19	-19
Dade	58	44	32	-26
Philadelphia	39	33	29	-10
Detroit	39	26	12	-27
Houston	53	39	25	-28
Broward	80	76	72	- 8
Dallas	61	45	30	-31
Baltimore City	35	27	21	-14
Fairfax	97	95	86	-11
Prince Georges Co.	85	67	46	-39
Hillsborough	74	74	75	1
Memphis	46	29	24	-22
San Diego	76	72	56	-20
Montgomery	94	89	78	-16
Jefferson KY	80	94	72	- 8
Duval FL	72	67	63	- 9
Baltimore Co.	96	93	86	-10
Washington DC	6	3	4	- 2
Milwaukee	73	62	45	-28
Clark Co. NV	--	81	77	- 4
Pinellas	83	83	82	- 1
New Orleans	32	19	12	-20
Orange Co Fl	93	78	72	-21
Cleveland	43	39	28	-15

Percent White

District	1968	1974	1980	Change
DeKalb	94%	84%	66%	-28%
Jefferson Co CO	98	94	93	- 5
Albuquerque	60	56	53	- 7
Charlotte NC	71	66	60	-11
Columbus	74	69	59	-15
Atlanta	38	15	8	-30
Palm Beach	70	66	63	- 7
Nashville	76	71	65	-11
Ann Arundel MD	86	86	84	- 2
Boston	68	52	35	-33
Fort Worth	67	55	44	-23
Indianapolis	66	57	49	-17
Mobile	58	55	56	- 2
Denver	66	54	41	-25
East Baton Rouge	--	60	57	- 3
St. Louis	36	30	21	-15
El Paso	42	37	28	-16
Jefferson Parish LA	78	74	66	-12
Granit UT	97	96	93	- 4
San Antonio	27	17	11	-16
Polk Co. Fl	--	77	77	0
Virginia Beach	88	88	85	- 3
Newark	18	11	9	- 9
Long Beach	85	74	53	-32
Cobb Co. GA	97	97	96	- 1
Tucson	66	65	62	- 4
Austin	--	63	53	-10
Cincinnatti	57	49	42	-15

Percent White

District	1968	1974	1980	Change
Portland	89%	84%	76%	-13%
Jefferson Co AL	--	80	83	3
Tulsa	83	77	69	-14
Seattle	82	74	57	-25
San Francisco	41	28	17	--24
Oakland	31	20	14	-17
Buffalo	61	52	47	-14
Fresno	70	66	54	-16
Brevard	--	87	84	- 3
Birmingham	49	37	24	-25
Caddo	--	48	45	- 3
San Juan	--	94	91	- 3
Toledo	71	66	62	- 9
Charleston	54	50	45	- 9
Wichita	85	78	72	-13
Pittsburgh	60	57	48	-12
Ysleta TX	--	30	23	- 7
Omaha	80	77	70	-10
Minneapolis	89	81	68	-21
Escambia	--	71	70	- 1
Winston Salem	72	68	63	- 9
Oklahoma City	78	67	55	-23
Kanawha WV	--	93	92	- 1
Sacramento	66	59	46	-20
Garden Grove	89	84	69	-20
Akron	74	69	64	-10
Davis	95	95	94	- 1
Kansas City	53	38	28	-25

Percent White

District	1968	1974	1980	Change
Norfolk VA	57%	47%	39%	-18%
Corpus Christi	--	39	28	-11
Richardson TX	95	--	90	- 5
St Paul	91	86	74	--17
Pasadena	94	87	71	-23
Anchorage	--	89	80	- 9
Volusia	--	79	78	- 1
Fulton	89	--	67	-22
Cumberland	--	69	62	- 7
Gwinnett	95	--	97	2
Prince William Co	94	91	88	- 6
Fort Wayne	--	81	77	- 4
Montgomery AL	94	52	47	- 5
Calcasieu	--	73	73	0
Mt Diablo	94	93	86	- 8
Aldine TX	71	--	63	- 8
Shawnee	--	98	96	- 2
Gary	29	19	8	-21
North East Tx	92	--	76	-16
Dayton City	61	52	43	-18
Flint	62	49	38	-24
Northside	82	--	57	-25
San Jose	68	71	64	- 4
Henrico Co	92	87	78	-14
Colorado Springs	--	84	82	- 2
Spring Branch	99	96	81	-18
Jersey City	44	30	19	-25
Santa Ana	63	--	21	-42

Appendix C. Percentage black enrollment in the nation's largest school districts, 1968-1980.

District	1968	1974	1980	Total change in percentage points, 1968-1980
NYC	31%	38%	38%	7%
LA	22	25	23	1
Chicago	53	58	60	7
Dade Co. Fl.	24	26	30	6
Philadelphia	59	62	63	4
Detroit	59	72	86	27
Houston	33	42	45	12
Broward Fl.	20	22	24	4
Dallas	31	43	49	18
Baltimore City	65	72	77	12
Fairfax Co.	3	4	7	4
Prince Georges Co.	15	31	50	35
Hillsborough Co	19	19	20	1
Memphis	54	71	75	21
San Diego	12	14	15	3
Montgomery	4	8	12	8
Jefferson Co. Ky	20	5	27	7
Duval Fl	28	33	36	8
Baltimore Co.	4	6	12	8
Washington DC	93	96	94	1
Milwaukee	24	33	46	22
Clark Co. NV	--	14	15	1
Pinellas	16	16	17	1
New Orleans	67	79	84	17
Orange Co.	7	19	23	16
Cleveland	56	57	67	11
Dekalb Co. Ga.	5	15	32	26

Percent Black

District	1968	1974	1980	Change
Jefferson Co. CO	0%	.2%	.6%	.4%
Albuquerque	2	3	3	1
Charlotte NC	29	34	38	9
Columbus	26	31	39	13
Atlanta	62	85	91	29
Palm Beach	28	29	29	1
Nashville	24	29	34	10
Ann Arundel MD	14	13	14	0
Boston	27	37	46	19
Fort Worth	25	33	37	12
Indianapolis	34	43	50	7
Mobile	42	45	43	1
Denver	14	18	23	9
East Baton Rouge	--	39	42	3
St.Louis	64	70	79	15
El Paso	3	3	4	1
Jefferson Parish LA	22	22	28	6
Granit UT	0	.3	.4	.1
San Antonio	15	16	15	0
San Francisco	28	30	27	- 1
Polk Co. Fl	--	21	21	0
Virginia Beach	12	10	11	- 1
Newark	72	72	71	- 1
Long Beach	8	13	19	11
Cobb Co. GA	3	3	3	0
Tucson	5	5	5	0
Austin	--	15	19	4
Greenville SC	22	24	26	4
Cincinnati	43	51	57	14

Percent Black

District	1968	1974	1980	Change
Norfolk VA	42%	51%	58%	16%
Corpus Christi	--	6	6	0
Richardson Tx	4	--	5	1
St. Paul	6	8	13	7
Pasadena	0	0	2	2
Anchorage	--	3	6	3
Volusia	--	21	20	- 1
Seminole Co.	--	--	14	--
Fulton Co.	11	--	32	21
Cumberland Co NC	--	26	33	7
Gwinnett Co. GA	5	--	2	- 3
Prince William Co.	6	7	9	3
Fort Wayne	--	17	20	3
Montgomery Co. ALA	--	48	53	5
Calcasieu	--	27	27	0
Mt. Diablo	0	1	2	1
Aldine TX	21	--	17	- 4
Shawnee Mission	--	1	2	1
Gary	62	73	87	25
Gaston NC	--	--	16	--
North East	0	--	3	3
Dayton City	38	48	57	19
Flint	37	49	59	22
Northside Tx	0	--	4	4
San Jose	1	2	2	1
Spring Branch	0	0	4	4
Des Moines	--	9	11	2
Jersey City	--	47	48	1
Henrico Co. VA	8	12	20	12

Percent Black

District	1968	1974	1980	Change
Portland	8%	12%	14%	6%
Jefferson Co ALA	--	20	16	- 4
Tulsa	12	17	23	9
Seattle	11	16	22	6
Oakland	55	66	66	11
Buffalo	37	43	47	10
Fresno	9	10	12	3
Brevard	--	12	14	2
Birmingham	51	63	76	25
Caddo	--	51	55	4
San Juan	--	1	2	1
Toledo	27	30	33	5
Charleston	46	49	54	8
Wichita	13	18	20	7
Pittsburgh	39	43	52	13
Isleta Tx	--	3	2	- 1
Omaha	18	20	25	7
Minneapolis	8	13	21	13
Escambia	--	28	27	- 1
Winston-Salem	28	31	36	8
Oklahoma City	28	28	35	7
Kanawha WV	--	7	7	0
Sacramento	14	18	22	8
Mesa	--	--	22	--
Garden Grove	0	1	1	0
Akron	26	30	35	9
Davis City UT	1	1	1	0
Kansas City	47	58	67	20

Percent Black

District	1968	1974	1980	Change
MUscogee Co GA	--%	36%	43%	7%
Fayette Co.	--	18	20	2
Richmond City	68	76	84	16
Colorado Springs	--	6	6	0
Santa Ana	7	--	6	- 1

TECHNICAL NOTES

The basic computer work for this report was done by DBS Corporation under subcontract to Opportunity Systems Inc. which prepared data then submitted for analysis by the Joint Center for Political Studies.

The regions used for analysis in this report include the following states:

SOUTH: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia
BORDER: Deleware, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, West Virginia
NORTHEAST: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont
MIDWEST: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin
WEST: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming

EXCLUDED: Hawaii and Alaska, because of unique ethnic composition and distance from other states assigned to regions

Exposure Indices-- the tables reporting the racial average composition of schools attended by blacks, Hispanics, and whites are determined by calculations using the following alegebraic formula, producing a figure commonly called an exposure index:

Exposure Index Showing Typical Exposure of White Students to Blacks in a School District

$$E_{W/B} = \left(\sum_i \frac{W_i}{W_D}\right) X \left(\frac{b_i}{W_i + b_i}\right) \quad X \quad 100$$

W_i is the number of white students in the ith school

W_D is the number of white pupils in the district

b_i is the number of black pupils in the district